

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/659,919	09/11/2003	Ruediger Guenter Kreuter	2968.215USU1 6015	
23552	7590 08/08/2005		EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC			PAIK, STEVE S	
P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	
·			DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/659,919	KREUTER, RUEDIGER GUENTER				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Steven S. Paik	2876				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 M	Mav 2005.					
	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.						
	• • •					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers	•					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 September 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	·	·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	· ·					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list		d				
	or the certified copies flot receive	u.				
Attachment(s)		(DTO 440)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔀 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/659,919 Page 2

Art Unit: 2876

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed May 27, 2005. The applicant amended claim 1. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chan et al. (US 6,588,673).

Re claims 1 and 8, Chan et al. disclose a system (Fig. 2c or 3) and a method for providing personalization solutions for smart cards (identity documents) comprising:

a portable personalization machine (smart card personalization system 130 or 300) that includes integrated therein:

i) at least one personalization unit (personalization equipment 136 or 330) for performing a personalization operation (such as printing or embossing data on the surface of the card, encoding the magnetic strip on the card, and programming cardholder data into microcontroller chip of the card) on an identity document (smart card 10),

Art Unit: 2876

ii) an identity document input for inputting (keyboard or magnetic tape reader, floppy disk drive, CD-ROM, or on-line connection through the Internet, a dedicated line, a cable, or satellite signal) an identity document to be personalized,

- iii) an identify document output (card printer) for outputting an identity document personalized by the personalization unit,
 - iv) a control unit (CPU of a PC) controlling the personalization unit (136 or 330),
- v) communications equipment (modems/cable modems) to permit communications with a controlling authority (card issuer system 112) remote (Fig. 2c or 3) from the personalization machine, and
- vi) an interface (HSM 114, 124, and 134 connected within a network) to permit connection to a local controller;

a controlling authority (card issuer system 112) remote from the personalization machine (smart card personalization system 130 or 300); and

a local controller (CPU of a PC) that is interfaceable with the interface of the personalization machine (Fig. 2c or 3).

Re claims 2 and 9, Chan et al. disclose the system and method as recited in rejected claims 1 and 8 stated above, wherein the personalization machine further includes an encryption unit for encrypting and decrying communications between the communications equipment of the personalization machine and the controlling authority (col. 4, ll. 28-48 and col. 8, ll. 18-58).

Re claims 5 and 12, Chan et al. disclose the system and method as recited in rejected claims 1 and 8 stated above, wherein the interface comprises an Ethernet connection (col. 9, ll. 51+)

Art Unit: 2876

Re claims 6 and 13, Chan et al. disclose the system and method as recited in rejected claims 1 and 8 stated above, wherein the personalization unit comprises a laser engraving unit, an ink-jet printer, or an integrated circuit chip programming unit (col. 3, ll. 12-23 and col. 8, ll. 50-58).

Re claims 7 and 14, Chan et al. disclose the system and method as recited in rejected claims 1 and 8 stated above, wherein the personalization unit is adapted to personalize cards (smart cards 10) or booklets.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan et al. (US 6,588,673) in view of Bade et al. (US 6,778,837).

Re claims 3, 4, 10, 11 and 15, Chan et al. disclose a system and a method for providing personalization solutions for smart cards (identity documents). The system includes, among other things, a card issuer system, a card processing system and a card personalization system. All of the systems that further include personal computing means are connected via a network such as the Internet, dedicated line, a cable or a satellite communication system.

However, Chan et al. do not disclose a personal computing means including a global positioning system receiver for mobile communications transceiver.

Art Unit: 2876

Bade et al. disclose a system and method for providing access to mobile devices based on positional data. The portable/wireless device can be any suitable mobile electronic device, such as a notebook (personal computer), personal data assistant (PDA), cellular/cordless telephone, or similar smaller device. The mobile device 104 accepts user input 208 from a user 102 and can be interconnected to a network environment 210, preferably wirelessly via a cellular or wireless modem networking system. The network environment 210 can be any suitable network, such as a local or intranet system or a wide area network like the Internet. The portable/wireless device comprises a receiver module for receiving positional information, which is subsequently processed to determine a proper authentication of a user.

In view of Bade et al., it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further employ a portable/mobile device with an authentication system based on positional information of a user in addition to the smart card personalization system of Chan et al. due to the fact that more personal identification data card can be programmed on a smart card with a minimum geographical limitation of where the personalization system is located. As long as the positional data is within defined parameters, the user/operator of the personalization system, the operator is not limited to a specific location to perform the personalization process of an identification document.

Re claim 16, Chan et al. in view of Bade disclose the method as recited in rejected claim 15 stated above, wherein the enable request comprises information on the current geographic location of the personalization machine (portable/wireless device 104 of Bade et al.), and further comprising checking the information in the enable request against information stored at the controlling authority (Fig. 2 and 3).

Art Unit: 2876

Re claim 17, Chan et al. in view of Bade disclose the method as recited in rejected claim 16 stated above, further comprising sending an enable signal from the controlling authority to the personalization machine if the enable request information matches the stored information at the controlling authority, wherein the enable signal enables operation of the personalization unit so that it can perform a personalization function (col. 3 line 46 - col. 4, line 59).

Re claim 18 Chan et al. in view of Bade disclose the method as recited in rejected claim 15 stated above, further comprising inputting local operator authorization (such as a password) and sending an enable request to the controlling authority for each operation of the personalization unit that requires operator intervention (col. 3, line 46 - col. 4, line 59).

Re claim 19, Chan et al. in view of Bade disclose the method as recited in rejected claim 15 stated above, further comprising inputting data to be personalized by the personalization unit into the personalization machine, sending the data to be personalized to the controlling authority, checking the data to be personalized against stored data at the controlling authority, and if there is a match, sending an authorization signal from the controlling authority to the personalization machine to enable the personalization unit to personalize the data onto the identity document.

6. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan et al. (US 6,588,673) as modified by Bade et al. (US 6,778,837) as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Tushie et al. (US 6,014,748).

The teachings of Chan et al. in view of Bade et al. have been discussed above.

Neither of the references specifically discloses a step of sending a report to a controlling authority after the completion of each personalization action.

Art Unit: 2876

Tushie et al. disclose a step of generating a report of the results of on each personalized process. The statistical information about the smart card personalization system would be a valuable tool for auditing of the system and measuring productivity of the system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the step of generating a production report of a smart card personalization process as taught by Tushie et al. into the teachings of Chan et al. in view of Bade et al. for the purpose of maximizing the productivity within the process fabricating a personalized smart card.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed May 27, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant states, "item 130 is not equivalent to the claimed personalization machine because item is not a single machine. Rather, item 130 constitutes items 132 and 136 which are separate machines".

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The Office Action indicates the recited portable personalization machine as the smart card personalization system (130 or 300) of Chan reference. Chan discloses (col. 6, lines 53+) that the **integrated card personalization system** 300 may include a host system 310 having a security board 320 installed therein for providing cryptographic functions needed to implement data security on the host system 310, and one or more personalization equipments 330.

As a comparison, the examiner excerpts the following from the Specification of the present application:

Art Unit: 2876

The table top machine 12 includes a personalization unit 16 which personalizes the document 14, a control unit 18 which controls operation of the machine 12, a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver 20, and a Global System for Mobil Communications (GSM) transceiver 22. The type of personalization unit 16 that is used will depend upon the intended use of the table top machine. Preferably, a single personalization unit 16 is provided to promote the portability of the machine 12. However, it is contemplated that more than one personalization unit could be provided.

Chan reference appears to be reading on the claimed invention without unreasonably applying the teachings of the reference.

It is noted that the applicant has not responded to the rejections of claims other than claims 1 and 8. Therefore, claims 1-21 remain rejected in view of above discussion and the previous Office Action.

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2876

Page 9

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven S. Paik whose telephone number is 571-272-2404. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (5:30am-2:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 571-272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven S. Paik
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2876